

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICKEY RYAN WILLIAMS, ) Case No. CV 16-0242-FMO (JPR)  
Petitioner, )  
v. ) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND  
STUART SHERMAN, Warden, ) RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.  
Respondent. ) MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition, the records and files of this case, and the Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge. On December 27, 2016, Petitioner, through counsel, filed Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, in which he mostly repeats and expands upon arguments he made in the Petition, Reply, and Supplemental Reply.

As the Magistrate Judge noted in the R. & R. (see R. & R. at 22 n.7), Petitioner's arguments are not without appeal. But as she also noted (id. & n.8), they concern California courts' interpretation of California statutory law. (See generally Objs. (citing exclusively California law other than to attempt to

1 distinguish federal cases relied upon by Magistrate Judge and  
2 cite standard for granting certificate of appealability).) It is  
3 not this Court's job to tell California courts how to interpret  
4 their own laws. See Bradshaw v. Richey, 546 U.S. 74, 76 (2005).  
5 The California courts heard, considered, and rejected  
6 Petitioner's arguments. This Court is bound by those  
7 determinations. Id.

8 Having reviewed the Petition and made a de novo  
9 determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation  
10 to which Petitioner objected, the Court concurs with and accepts  
11 the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED  
12 that Judgment be entered denying the Petition and dismissing this  
13 action with prejudice.

14  
15 DATED: January 30, 2017

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
FERNANDO M. OLGUIN  
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28